

Act serves as a waiver of sovereign immunity and a jurisdictional grant, but it does not create a substantive cause of action. Jan's Helicopter Serv., Inc. v. Fed. Aviation Admin., 525 F.3d 1299, 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2008). A plaintiff, therefore, must establish that “a separate source of substantive law . . . creates the right to money damages.” Id. (quoting Fisher v. United States, 402 F.3d 1167, 1172 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc in relevant part)).

It is well established that complaints that are filed by pro se plaintiffs are held to “less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). Nonetheless, even pro se plaintiffs must persuade the Court that jurisdictional requirements have been met. Bernard v. United States, 59 Fed. Cl. 497, 499 (2004), aff'd, 98 F. App'x 860 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

In this case, the Court lacks jurisdiction over Ms. Jones-Zeigler's claims. First, to the extent that Ms. Jones-Zeigler's claims are against parties other than the United States, those claims are not within this Court's Tucker Act jurisdiction. See United States v. Sherwood, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941) (“jurisdiction is confined to the rendition of money judgments in suits brought for that relief against the United States . . . and if the relief sought is against others than the United States the suit as to them must be ignored as beyond the jurisdiction of the court.”) (citations omitted). Second, “[t]he ADA is not a statute mandating payment by the United States.” Searles v. United States, 88 Fed. Cl. 801, 805 (2009). “Indeed, the ADA does not apply to the federal government as an employer and district courts hold exclusive jurisdiction over ADA claims.” Id. (citing 42 U.S.C. §§ 12111(2), (5), 12112 (2008); Boddie v. United States, 86 F.3d 1178 (Fed.Cir.1996)). Therefore, this Court lacks jurisdiction over Ms. Jones-Zeigler's ADA claims.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing, the government's motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) is **GRANTED**, and Ms. Jones-Zeigler's complaint is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.² The Clerk is directed to enter judgment accordingly. Each side shall bear its own costs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ELAINE KAPLAN
JUDGE

² Ms. Jones-Zeigler has also filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. ECF No. 2. That motion is **GRANTED**.